

REFLECTIONS

UPON

A Late Book,

ENTITLED,

The Case of Allegiance Consider'd :

Wherein is shewn, that the

Church of *England's* Doctrine

OF

Non-Resistance and *Passive Obedience,*

Is not inconsistent with Taking

The New Oaths

TO

Their Present MAJESTIES.

Licens'd and Enter'd according to Order.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *Richard Baldwin*, near the *Black Bull*
in the *Old Baily*, 1689.

REFLECTIONS

UPON

A Late Book

ENTITLED

The City of Alliances

Wherein is shown, that the

Church of England's Doctrine

Not-Resistance and Passive Obedience

Is not inconsistent with Justice

in the Present Case

1689

1587

Rf

Printed for Andrew Baskin, at the Black Bull
in the Old Bailey

REFLECTIONS

UPON

A Late Book,

ENTITLED,

The Case of Allegiance consider'd.

S I R,

YOU desire my Opinion concerning the Author and the Treatise of *The Case of Allegiance*; which I sent you, hoping that you being of a judgment dissatisfied in that case, it might have some influence for your Conviction: But the

Answer which you returned me with that Book, was, *That you thought the Author to be a partial man, no Minister of the Established Church.* And although the Treatise might, as some Beauties, have a general approbation, yet there was in it something of an Air which did not please you; and though you dealt with it, as *Martial* with *Sabadius*,

*Non Amo te Sabade nec possum dicere quare,
Hoc tantum possum dicere non amo te.*

Yet knowing you to be a good Scholar, and an honest man, I resumed the Book, and gave it a diligent Research;

B

and

Query, Burgin #319 was 625 12/30/53 2/6 (Burgin)

and upon second thoughts, am induced to think, that the Author was either of the number of the ancient *Nonconformists* in the Reign of King *Charles I.* or of those who of late are known by the name of *Trimmers*, or at least a *Latitudinarian*, much differing in his Principles of Loyalty from those which have been taught and practised by the Church of *England*, as by the Blessing of God it stands Established: A City-Minister I believe he may be, (as he names himself) but whether of the number of those that are by Law Established, I much doubt.

However, I do declare, that I am fully satisfied as to the design of the Author, That we may and ought to pay our Allegiance to King *WILLIAM* and Queen *MART*, whom I pray God long to preserve and prosper, yet can I not approve of the Premises from which he would infer that Conclusion: for notwithstanding the many Male Administrations of the late King, I suppose (with submission to those that judge otherwise) that we ought not, for those Reasons, to have made actual Resistance (as we did not) by taking Arms against him, nor that the late King did thereby forfeit his Right to the Crown, this being, as I yet conceive, contrary to our Oaths and Declarations, and contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of that Church whereof we profess our selves Members.

To which I add this Reason, because we should hereby justify that unnatural Rebellion which was so fatally carried on against King *Charles* the First of blessed Memory; against whom it was suggested, That he had been accessory to the poisoning of his Father; that he endeavoured to introduce Popery and Arbitrary Government; to bring in *German* Horse, and other foreign Forces into the Land; and causelessly imposed Fines and Imprisonment on his Subjects: All which notwithstanding, I cannot think those otherwise than Rebels, that raised War against him. And I hope their present Majesties will not be displeased, if we still

still retain our first Principles of Non-resistance and Passive Obedience, during their Government: Nor once suspect, that they who have maintained and practised them under such unhappy Circumstances, as they were reduced to by the Evil Conduct and Counsels of the late King, will cast off this which the Author calls *Super-Loyalty*; as if it were contrary to a true English Temper, and a peaceful Settlement of Church and State. And as for our *Super-Conformity*, I think there needs no other Apology than what this Author hath made, (*viz.*) That before the Church was secretly practised upon by the Arts of her subtle Adversary, (which (by the way) did not prevail either with the chiefest for Dignity, or with the most for number, who perceived the Design of our Adversaries was to divide us, and thereby to destroy us) it was easily to be discovered that her (*i. e.*) the Churches Principles of Conformity and Loyalty were far more moderate and intelligible than those which have been since that time most industriously and impetuously recommended under her venerable Name: So that by this I cannot conceive how the Church should oblige the present Government to treat her with less kindness than she doth expect, as the Author doth suggest, *pag. 34.*

But here it will be demanded what security we will give for our Allegiance to the present Government, and on what foundation we lay that Allegiance. I answer to the first, Our Security shall be our Doctrine of Non-resistance and Passive Obedience, which we have always practised in far more difficult times and circumstances, than we can fear to see under the present Government. *Secondly*, Our Security shall be the taking of the New Oaths, which we have seen and maturely considered, and by the help of God shall religiously observe, as we did our former Oaths, although the late King before his departure did absolve us from them, and much more by his deserting of us, and as

much as in him lay, gave us up to Confusion: All which notwithstanding, there are still among us some sober men, so nicely scrupulous, that they conceive themselves under the obligation of them; though I doubt not, but the generality of the Members of our Church will be *ex animo*, full Conformists to those Oaths.

As to the second demand, on what foundation we lay our Allegiance to the present Government, I answer, We have an Act of Parliament in the Reign of *Henry* the Seventh, for our indemnity, as to the Law of the Land; and I think we have a Statute in an higher Court, *Rom. 13. 1. Let every soul be subject to the higher powers*, the reason whereof is, *for there is no power but of God*; (and) *the powers that be*, *ei de Deo Quibus et de Deo Principibus*, for the translation of which, I suppose we have no need of the correction which our Author doth make, (*viz.*) There is no Authority, if not of God, and the Authorities which are (of God's institution) are ordered under God: for I think our Translation is the best, (*viz.*) *For there is no power but of God, and the powers that are* (i. e.) are in being *de facto*, are ordained of God, who giveth them to whom he pleaseth. And it is no difficult task to shew that the Power then in being, was but an Usurpation on the Senate of *Rome*, by the Army and such Favourites as they set up for Emperours, against the Right of the Senate; of which, if need were, I could give sufficient Testimonies of very Learned men, nor can I think that the *Scripture* was intended to be understood in such a critical sence, as to signifie precisely only such Powers as are *de Jure*, lawful.

But I depend not on either or both of these, nor on those overt acts which the late King did wilfully commit; whereby he did abdicate the Government of the Kingdom of *England*, *quâ talis*, long before he left the Land; for the Government being an Office entrusted for Administration according to Laws, and the late King's Grandfather having

ving declared to his Subjects in the *Star Chamber*, June 20. 1616. that being sworn to Maintain the Laws of the Land, he should be perjured if he should alter them; and our ancient Lawyers declaring, that *Non est Rex ubi dominatur voluntas & non lex*. And that of *Fleta*, *Rex non à regnando sed regendo, nam Rex est dum bene regit Tyrannus cum populum opprimit*. And *Spelman* of the word *Allegiantia*, that it is a word importing *vinculum Arctius inter regem & subditos utrosque invicem connectens*. And the resolution of some very judicious Divines, that if one party that is mutually engaged, do violate his obligation, the other is not obliged, and that that Oath is not to be kept, the execution whereof is destructive of the common safety.

On these grounds many great men may judge, that for these and the like causes, a Crown may be forfeited; yet I suppose there are other Foundations layed by those great men in which I do acquiesce: As first, that the present King being a free Prince, and no Subject of the King of *England*, and having a right Title to the Succession to the Crown of *England*, as well in his own right as in right of his Queen, whereof he was endeavoured by the subtil arts of Jesuits to be deprived; and the present King being also constituted the Head of the Protestant party, who were destined to utter ruin, by confederacies against them, did for these causes successfully vindicate his Title and the legal Succession, and put the Protestant Cause in a fair way of establishment, upon which success the late King having deserted first the Government, and then the Land, and fled to an inveterate Enemy of our Religion and Nation, whether through his own or the counsel of the Jesuits, to whose conduct he had committed his Conscience, and the administration of the Government, directly contrary to the Laws of the Land, and leaving us under a standing Army, wherein was a considerable party of *Irish* Papists, who being left unpaid, and ordered to disband, were likely to be very

very injurious to the *English* Subjects; I am convinced, that he hath lawfully vindicated the Succession to himself and the Royal Family.

And secondly, I assent to the judgment of my Superiors, that the Crown of *England* being thus made void, was rightfully set on the Heads of the present King and Queen; and that the present Transactions are much more justifiable than what was done in the Case of *Henry* the Seventh, and acknowledged by Parliament; my Reasons whereof I shall give hereafter, and shall now give you my Remarks on the *Case of Allegiance*, wherewith I was generally well pleased both with the Matter and Stile, and which, I hope, may have a good effect with many men for their full satisfaction, for which I verily believe it was charitably and ingeniously intended by the Author, until in the last Page I read this following passage, whereupon I began to make my Remarks, (*viz*) *That in the next Reign after King James, (which all know was that glorious Martyr Charles First) when Popish and French Counsels found admission at our Court, then arose together the new Principles of Super-conformity in the Church, and Super-Loyalty in the State, which like a preternatural ferment, have ever since disturbed the peace of both, and must be again cast out, if ever we recover a true English temper, or peaceful settlement, &c.* This, and some other passages, which I shall name, made me suspect, that he was under some discontent, though p. 2. he says, *he had no angry resentment of his sufferings.* And p. 19. speaking of the Bishops who petitioned the late King, he calls them, *some of his Bishops.* And of the Clergy he says, p. 31. *There have been for some time a Party among us who have appropriated to themselves the Church of England, exclusive of their Brethren, yet we shall find enough on our side to justify our Doctrines to be consistent with her Principles.* And p. 32. *That the Principles of Loyalty which obtained in the Church at that time, (viz. Queen Elizabeth) were no other than what he asserts.*

He

He would prove from the Prayer, they are charged with by the Parliament in *Queen Mary's* Reign, That God would turn her heart from Idolatry, to the true Faith, or else shorten her days, and take her quickly out of the way; and more to this purpose out of the Journal of *Simon D'Eurs*, of which I doubt not to say, that these Assertions are not agreeable to the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *England*:

These passages did a little amuze me, as reflecting too severely on the best of Kings and the most discreetly Loyal Church in the World. As for the King of Blessed Memory, his first years were full of peace, till being reduced to some necessities, not thro' his own fault, but such as by other unhappy circumstances he was reduced to, some Malecontents took advantage thereof to drive him to greater; the vogue was his being misled by evil Counsellors, such as the Arch-bishop and *Strafford*, who I have reason to believe were as far from *Poper*y or *French* Counsels, as any Ministers of State before or since. As for that good Prince, I can't without indignation hear, that he inclined to Popish Counsels, for tho' he be termed the head of the *Grotian* Religion, and *Grotius* for an arrant Papist, yet it is well known in what Religion he both lived and died, as also did those two great Ministers, the Earl and the Arch-bishop; of whom Sir *Edw. Dearing* said, *That he had smitten the great Champion of the Papists under the fifth rib*. And though the King married to a *French* Lady, yet he espoused not her Religion, much less the Counsels of that Court to which he was alway averse. Yet I remember it was said by a late Writer, *That the Parliament* (whom he was bound to believe) *made it their great argument and advantage against the King, that he favoured the Papists*; on which supposition thousands came in to fight for their cause. And one Article against the Arch-bishop was, *That he endeavoured to introduce Popery*; though Mr. *Prynne* proved a design of the Papists to cut them

them both off, as their most formidable Enemies. And the Relation of Dr. *Du Moulin* saith, That at the death of that good King, a known Papist was heard to say, *That now their greatest Enemy was cut off.* I think no good man will accuse the Nation of Super-Loyalty in the State, when so much real Mischief was wrought by such groundless Jealousies, that caused a fatal War against so Religious a Prince; and by the same Arts a preternatural Ferment (as he says) has ever since disturbed the Peace of the State.

As to the other head, the Super-Conformity that troubled the Church, which must be cast out, or (he says) there can never be a peaceful Settlement in the Church, I would gladly be informed whether the many Sects which have abounded among us, all which conspired against both the Church and State, were not rather the Superfetations of the first Nonconformists, who raised Divisions in, and Separation from the Church on the like pretences, that the Bishops were Popishly affected: Which Ferment made the Presbyterians and other Sects to impute Popery to the Bishops ever since the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign; and such a Suspicion the Author would still cherish in the minds of the People. And whether the Author be not soured with the same Ferment, that calls the Petitioning Bishops, some of his (i. e. *James the Second's*) Bishops, I much doubt. Nor can I tell how he should be of the Church of *England*, and yet record his Sufferings, unless for some Nonconformity he was one of the Excluded Brethren; which I guess by his distinguishing between the Doctrines on his side, (i. e.) the Excluded Brethren, and those of the Church of *England*, which he would make to be consistent: which I shall disprove, 1. By shewing what was the Doctrine of *Allegiance* constantly received in the Church of *England*; not from the Reign of *Charles the First*, but from the beginning of the Reformation. And 2^{ly}, What is the different Doctrine that hath been taught by him and his Excluded

Excluded Brethren, and the Reader may guess how irreconcilable they are.

Now the reasons of this my endeavour, are, 1. The great Scandal that might justly be imputed to the Church, if she should be so inconstant as to recede from her own Doctrine.

2ly, From the jealousy which the Kings, under whose protection the Church subsists, might entertain of her, if the Doctrine of *Resistance* should be allowed by her.

3ly, Because in the case which hath now hapned, she hath not made use of any *Resistance*.

4ly, Because some whom the Author calls Super-loyal and Super conforming persons, for their maintaining the Doctrine of *Non-resistance*, may be thought to have now cast it off, and are disposed to engage in a Rebellion against a lawful Prince for Male-Administrations.

I begin with the first, viz. to shew what was the Doctrine of *Allegiance* professed in the Church of *England* ever since the first Reformation. The judgment of the Bishops in the days of *Henry VIII.* and *Edward VI.* who were our first Reformers, did set forth a Book called, *The Institution of a Christian Man*, whereof *Cranmer, Ridley*, and other Martyrs, were the Compilers. On the fifth Commandment they say, *Subjects be bound not to withdraw their Fealty, Truth, Love, and Obedience towards their Prince, for any cause whatsoever; ne for any cause may they conspire against his Person, ne do any thing towards the hurt thereof, nor of his Estate.* And by this Command they be bound to obey all the Laws, Proclamations, Precepts, and Commandments made by their Prince, except they be contrary to the Commandments of God. And on the sixth Commandment, *No Subjects may draw the Sword against the Prince, for any cause whatsoever it be; and though Princes, which be the Supream Heads of their Realms, do otherwise than they ought, yet God hath assigned no Judges over them in this World.* To these succeeded the Authors of the *Homelies*, whereof Bishop *Jewel* is said to be the Pen-man: Of these, the Author says, p. 32:

That they teach us to submit to lawful Authority, and to know our bounden Duty to common Authority; but they teach no Loyalty besides or contrary to Law. Her Homelies no-where that I know of, assert the Errours that I have here condemned, or condemn any of the Positions I have here asserted.

Now, *Homely* the first against Rebellion, says, p. 1. *That Kings and Princes, as well the evil as the good, do reign by God's Ordinance, and that Subjects are bound to obey them. If Servants ought to obey their Masters, not only being gentle, but froward, much more ought Subjects to be obedient to their sharp and rigorous Princes.*

Rebellion is worse than the worst Government of the worst Prince that hitherto hath been. What if a Prince be evil indeed, and undiscree, and it is evident to all mens eyes that he is so? I ask again, what if it be long of the wickedness of his Subjects that he is so, shall the Subjects by their wickedness both provoke God to give them an evil and indiscreet Prince for their punishment, and also rebel against him and against God? Hear what the Scripture says, *God makes a wicked man to reign, for the punishment of a people.* Let us deserve to have a good Prince, or let us patiently suffer and obey such as we deserve; and whether the Prince be good or evil, let us pray for his continuance and increase in Goodness, if he be good; or for his amendment, if he be Evil. Our Liturgy, our Articles, our Constitutions, do all inculcate the same Duty: So have the prime Bishops and Ministers of the Church, especially Bishop *Andrews* and Bishop *Sanderson*, in the Reigns of King *James* and King *Charles* the first, who condemned the Doctrine of Resistance as a Popish Doctrine. Thus Bishop *Sanderson*, in a Sermon preached July 26. 1640. when that unnatural Rebellion began, on 1 Cor. 10. 23. says, *That no conjuncture of circumstances whatsoever, can make that to be done at any time, which in it self is unlawful, and to take up Arms against a lawful Sovereign, offensive or defensive, may not be done at any time, in any*

any case, upon any pretence whatsoever. And on 1 Tim. 3. 16. As for our Accusers, if no more were to be instanced in then that one accursed Position alone, wherein notwithstanding their agreement in other things, they both (*i. e.* the Dissenters and Papists) do consent, *viz.* That lawful Sovereigns may be by their Subjects resisted, and Arms taken up against them for the Cause of Religion, it were enough to make good the Challenge against them both, which is so notorious a piece of ungodliness, as no man that either feareth God or the King as he ought, can speak or think of, without detestation.

And beyond these Doctrines I suppose no Super-Loyalty hath been taught, nor beneath these hath the Church of *England* at any time practised. How they behaved themselves in the Rebellion against *Charles I.* doth appear by their constant adherence to him, and sacrificing their Lives and Fortunes to his Service. Their Loyalty to *Charles* the Second, was not any way culpable, unless their Super-Loyalty was a crime. And to *James* the Second, had not the *Monmouth* Rebellion, to which the Sectaries gave assistance, been opposed by those of the Church, he might have been more certainly forced out of the World, than he was out of his Kingdom.

Hitherto then we find no resistance in the Doctrine or Practice of the Church; and I hope, that until there be any cause given, our present Gracious Sovereigns, they never will on any malicious suggestions, or groundless jealousies, entertain a contrary Opinion of the Church, or any of her true Members.

The only thing therefore to be considered is, what hath been done as to resistance in this late Revolution; how the chief Bishops of the Church behaved themselves under his Reign is fresh in memory; that in all lawful things they yielded submission and obedience, and in things unlawfully imposed, they made no resistance, but submitted to even

illegal Impositions, Fines, and Imprisonments, until the King's deserting of them; whereby he became as if he were naturally dead; the case of *Allegiance* was altered and utterly ceased. It is but vainly objected, that the late King was forced to desert the Government, which in truth he never intended to administer as he ought; which intention was evidently declared, notwithstanding his Coronation-Oath, by the whole series of his Government, having wholly devoted himself to the Counsels of Popish Ministers, for the Subversion of the Established Religion and Laws, and for the setting of Popery and Arbitrary Government, at the cost of his Life; wherein being by a wonderful Providence disappointed, he chose to desert the Government, I say he *chose*, having declared, *He would do it, or die in the Attempt.*

Now suppose a man doth drink to that excess that he looeth his Reason, and in his Drunkenness is guilty of Murder, or sets his own House on fire, and leaves it in a flame that threatneth the consuming of the Neighbourhood, such a person is by the Law adjudged a wilful Criminal, and must suffer accordingly. And doubtless, if men be intoxicated by destructive Opinions, tending to their own, as well as the destruction of others, and by obstinacy in them, commit things contrary to the Rules of Religion, Law, and Reason, and draw on themselves a necessity of flying for it; such actions shall be accounted voluntary: for thus when God gives up wilful Sinners, after long continuance in their sins, against all the methods of Grace which have been despised by them, to follow the hardness of their own Hearts, and ungodly Lusts, all the sins, as well those committed before, as after their judiciary hardness, shall be imputed to them as their voluntary acts: so is it in this case. And if the Fires kindled by a drunken man in his fury be quenched, and that man becoming more sober, shall desire to return again, when the

Neighbour-

Neighbourhood have just cause to suspect he will return again to his former Madness, I cannot see that they have any reason to admit of him, or to confide in him.

And that the late King did voluntarily forsake his Kingdom, that which the Author says, is a material proof, (*viz.*) That the King declared to a Person of Credit, *That the Queen obtained from him a solemn Oath on the Sacrament, on the Sunday, That if she went for France on Monday, he would not fail to follow her on Tuesday.* And though his Subjects used some force to hinder his Flight, yet they used none to compel him to it.

I may seem to call in question the Judgment of the present Parliament, if I should think their Wise Counsel and Determination stood in need of any farther confirmation; I return therefore to shew what I chiefly intended, *viz.* that notwithstanding any thing that hath been done by the Church of England, there is no cause to charge her with prevaricating in the Doctrine of *Non-resistance*: But the contrary is insinuated in the Author, and other late Writers; as where, in p. 13. he says, *In some cases a Defensive Resistance may not only be lawful, but a necessary Duty.* P. 14. *Whatever Grievance is without or contrary to Law, the Subject is not bound to bear it, and we are not bound to yield Passive Obedience to the King. That in some unhappy Circumstances (which he mentioneth) the Subjects will be excusable before God, if they use so much Resistance as he hath made necessary for preserving the Government and themselves.* Pag. 18. He mentioneth the deposing of Edward II. and Richard II. to prove, that the Nobles and Commons of England may remove a King from his Government. Pag. 26. *When the Kingdoms of the World are become Christ's by incorporating his Religion among their Civil Rights, then we may use any Expedients for the Defence of our Religion, which we may use in defending any Priviledges of our Civil Establishment.* And p. 27. *If it was lawful for the People of England,*

England, in an extream necessity, to remove a King whose Government was become inconsistent with the Publick Weal, and to set up another, by whom the Publick Interest may be secured, it is lawful still, notwithstanding our Oaths or Declaration. These Positions are so far from any consistency with the Church-Homelies, that they were the grounds on which the War against King Charles the first was carried on, and on which the prevailing People and Souldiery destroyed him, and might have set up Cromwel to be their King. Pag. 33. 34. Having mentioned divers instances for Resistance, he concludes, *Such were the Principles of the Church of England in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth and King James.* And p. 32. *That the Principles of Loyalty were no other at that time, than what he had asserted, we may easily satisfy our selves from that Form of Prayer they are charged with by the Parliament in Queen Mary's Reign, (viz.) That God would turn her heart from Idolatry, to the true Faith, or else shorten her days, and take her quickly out of the way.*

Now certainly this Form of Prayer was not in the Church-Liturgy, but it is as certain that they were the Foamings of some Extemporary Zealots in their Conventicles; concerning which, the Act 1^o & 2^o *Phil. and Mary* says, *Such a Prayer was never heard or read of to be used by any good Christian man against any Prince, though he were a Pagan.*

The Church of *England* had learnt to pray for them that persecute them, to bless, and not to curse their Enemies; especially Kings, and those that were in Authority: I shall therefore commend the Author to Mr. Pryme, for his information what sort of People used this Form of Prayer, p. 65. of his Second Part of *The Loyalty of Pious Christians*, where he says, *That Queen Mary's zealous Protestant Bishops, Ministers, and Subjects likewise, made constant Prayers for her; but some over zealous Anabaptistical Fanaticks, using some unchristian Prayers against her, That God would cut*
her

her off and shorten her days, occasioned this special Act against such Prayers. And p. 66. he adds, *These Prayers were much against, and directly contrary to the Judgment of Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Farter, Bishop Hooper, Rowland Taylor, John Philpot, John Bradford, Edward Crome, John Rogers, Laurence Sanders, Edward Laurence, Miles Coverdale, Bishop of Exon, and others of our godly Protestant Bishops and Ministers, who soon after suffered as Martyrs.* (And perhaps the rather for this Provocation :) for in their Letter, May 8. 1554. they profess, *That as obedient Subjects, we shall behave our selves towards Queen Mary, and all that be in Authority, and not cease to pray to God for them, that he would govern them all generally and particularly with the Spirit of Wisdom and Grace ; and so we heartily pray and desire all men to do, in no point consenting to any kind of Rebellion or Sedition against our Sovereign Lady ; but where they cannot obey, but must disobey God, there to submit themselves with all patience and humility, to suffer what the will and pleasure of the Higher Powers shall adjudge.*

And Bishop Hooper wrote his Apology against the scandalous Reports made of him, that he should encourage and maintain such as cursed Queen Mary, wherein he vindicates his Innocency and Loyalty, in praying for Queen Mary.

Now how ingenuously these things are objected to the first Reformers of the Church to cast a Scandal on them, I leave to the impartial Reader to judge ; as also whether the Doctrines and Practices of such as dissented from her, which are neither seasonable nor grateful to be now recounted, can give our Governours better security for their Allegiance, than that which the Author calls Super-Loyalty. And I am confident it cannot be suspected, that that Church which opposed that Flood of Arbitrary Power which was breaking in upon them, refusing the publishing of that Declaration, which would have owned the Dispen-

sing

ing Power, to their great hazard, and did so innocently and patiently wait for the salvation of the Lord, will cast off their Super-Loyalty to our present most gracious King and Queen, whom God and the Nation have so wonderfully established. For my part, I think that although on the present occasion and emergencies, we do part with some extraordinary supplies, we shall make a very advantageous Bargain and cheap Purchase of the Re-establishment of our Religion, Laws, and Liberties, which were so nigh to a total Subversion: And for the preservation whereof, if it had been lawful, we should not have counted our Blood too dear.

F I N I S.

Chun